

REMARKS

The Office Action of 06/24/2010 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Compliance with Section 101

Claims 54-69 and 100-111 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 54 and 62 have been amended in view of the Examiner's remarks and are now believed to present statutory subject matter.

With respect to claims 100-111, the foregoing rejection is traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested. The rejection states in part: "[T]he claims do not recite a device or machine (e.g. a computer) which is used for carrying out the claimed method...." This statement is incorrect. Independent claims 102 and 108 are directed not to methods but to particular systems or machines and are therefore directed to patentable subject matter per se.

With respect to independent claims 100 and 106, these claims do in fact recite a device or machine used to carry out the claimed method, namely an ultrasound imaging system (claim 100) or ultrasound system review station (claim 106), recited in each of the claimed steps of the body of the claim. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be directed to statutory subject matter.

Compliance With Section 103

Claims 54-69 and 100-111 were rejected as being unpatentable over Brant in view of Gould. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Brant relates to voice control of a medical apparatus having electronically controlled instruments and control switches (Abstract) such as an intraocular surgical instrument. Speech is

used exclusively to translate a speech command into a control action. An example of such a control action is change of the "vitrectomy cut rate" (col. 3, line 62).

Gould, on the other hand, relates to speech input and control for PC productivity software. Interspersed text and commands are distinguished and input to application software as either text keystrokes or command keystrokes. The translation of speech into text is commonly referred to as "speech-to-text."

The invention of claim 54 relates to a method for using voice commands to insert a textual phrase into a section of an ultrasound examination report. A voice command is received from a voice input device of an ultrasound imaging system to insert a textual phrase into a section of an ultrasound imaging report, and a set of textual phrases associated with the section is identified. The voice command is converted into a textual phrase selected from the identified set of textual phrases and is inserted into the section.

It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Brant and Gould to arrive at the invention of claim 54. Text input, which makes sense in the PC context of Gould, does not make sense in the context of Brant or in the context of prior art medical equipment generally as evidenced by the prior art of record. More especially, the speech-to-text feature of Gould finds no obvious application to ultrasound equipment according to the teachings of the prior art. There is *no teaching* or suggestion in the cited references of inputting *non-command text* to ultrasound equipment or any other medical equipment. The proposed combination of Gould with Brant does not and cannot alter this fact--the speech-to-text feature of Gould would be useless in Brant. Furthermore, by extension, there cannot be inferred any teaching or suggestion of applying speech-to-text methods to ultrasound or other medical equipment.

Claim 54 sets forth various particulars none of which are taught or suggested in any of the cited references, including:

- (a) receiving a voiced command from a voice input device of an ultrasound imaging system to insert a textual phrase into a section of an ultrasound examination report;
- (b) with the ultrasound imaging system, identifying a set of textual phrases associated with the section;
- (c) with the ultrasound imaging system, converting the received voiced command into a textual phrase selected from the set of textual phrases identified in (b); and
- (d) with the ultrasound imaging system, inserting the textual phrase selected in (c) into the section.

Accordingly, claim 54 and its dependent claims are believed to patentably define over the cited references.

Claim 62 is believed to patentably define over the cited references for similar reasons. As compared to claim 54, which relates to an ultrasound imaging system, claim 62 relates to an ultrasound review station.

As with claim 54, claim 62 sets forth various particulars none of which are taught or suggested in any of the cited references, including:

- (a) receiving a voiced command from a voice input device of an ultrasound review station to insert a textual phrase into a section of an ultrasound examination report;
- (b) with the ultrasound review station, identifying a set of textual phrases associated with the section;
- (c) with the ultrasound review station, converting the received voiced command into a textual phrase selected from the set of textual phrases identified in (b); and

(d) with the ultrasound review station, inserting the textual phrase selected in (c) into the section.

Accordingly, claim 62 and its dependent claims are believed to patentably define over the cited references.

Claims 100 and 106, which relate to an ultrasound imaging system and an ultrasound review station, respectively, each set forth various particulars none of which are taught or suggested by any of the cited references. These include, in the case of claim 100:

- (b) with the ultrasound imaging system, converting the voice signal into text; and
- (c) with the ultrasound imaging system, inserting the text into an ultrasound examination report.

In the case of claim 106, these features include:

- (b) with the ultrasound review station, converting the voice signal into text; and
- (c) with the ultrasound review station, inserting the text into an ultrasound examination report.

Accordingly, claims 100 and 106, together with their dependent claims, are believed to patentably define over the cited references.

Claims 102 and 108, which relate to an ultrasound imaging system and an ultrasound review station, respectively, each recite in part: "a voice recognition unit coupled with the voice input device, the voice recognition unit being operative to convert a voice signal received from the voice input device into text." As previously noted, there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references of inputting non-command text to ultrasound or other medical equipment. The proposed combination of Gould with Brant does not and cannot alter this fact. Furthermore, by

extension, there cannot be inferred any teaching or suggestion of applying speech-to-text methods to ultrasound or other medical equipment.

Accordingly, claims 102 and 108, together with the dependent claims, are believed to patentably define over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seek early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (650) 694-5810.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation
Customer No. 28524
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted:
/Jenny G. Ko/

Jenny G. Ko, Reg. No. 44,190
Attorney for Applicant(s)
650-694-5810
Date: September 23, 2010